

FILED

2014 FEB 12 PM 2:51

CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DIST. OF CALIF.  
LOS ANGELES

JOHN BURTON (SBN 86029)  
jb@johnburtonlaw.com  
THE LAW OFFICES OF JOHN BURTON  
4 East Holly St. Suite 201  
Pasadena, CA 91103  
Tel.: 626-449-8300/Fax: 626-449-4417

PAULA D. PEARLMAN (SBN 109038)  
Paula.Pearlman@lls.edu  
ANNA RIVERA (SBN 239601)  
Anna.Rivera@lls.edu  
DISABILITY RIGHTS LEGAL CENTER  
800 S. Figueroa Street, Suite 1120  
Los Angeles, CA 90017  
Tel.: (213) 736-1496/Fax: (213) 736-1428

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

## CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JONATHAN MEISTER, an individual,  
and GREATER LOS ANGELES  
AGENCY ON DEAFNESS, INC.,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

CITY OF HAWTHORNE;  
HAWTHORNE POLICE  
DEPARTMENT; ROBERT D. FAGER,  
Individually and in his Official Capacity  
as the Chief of Police; Officer JEFFREY  
SALMON; Officer JEFFREY TYSL;  
Officer ERICA BRISTOW; Officer  
MARK HULTGREN and DOES 1-10,  
Inclusive.

Defendants.

CASE NO. **CV 14-1096 MWF(SHX)**

COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY  
AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AND  
DAMAGES PURSUANT TO:

1. Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (42 U.S.C. §§ 12131 et. seq.);
2. Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. § 794 et. seq.);
3. California Government Code § 11135;
4. 42 U.S.C. § 1983; and
5. California Civil Code §§ 51, 51.7, 52, 52.1, 54, 54.1, and 54.3.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

## JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. This action arises under the laws of the United States, including the American with Disabilities Act (“ADA” and (42 U.S.C. §12131 *et seq.*) (The "ADA"), Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. § 794) (the "Rehabilitation Act"), as well as 42 U.S.C. § 1983, such that the Court has jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1343. Through the same events and omissions that form the basis for Plaintiffs’ federal claims, Defendants have also violated Plaintiffs’ rights under state law, over which this Court has supplemental jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367. This Court has jurisdiction over Plaintiffs’ claims for declaratory and injunctive relief pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2201 and 2202 and Rule 65 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

2. Venue over Plaintiffs’ claims is proper in the Central District of California because Defendants reside in the Central District of California within the meaning of 28 U.S.C. § 1394, and because the events, acts, and omissions giving rise to Plaintiffs’ claims occurred in the Central District of California.

## INTRODUCTION

Plaintiffs JONATHAN MEISTER and the GREATER LOS ANGELES AGENCY ON DEAFNESS, INC. (GLAD) bring this action for equitable relief and damages against the CITY OF HAWTHORNE, the HAWTHORNE POLICE DEPARTMENT (“HPD”), the HPD Chief of Police and various HPD officers for failing to provide effective communication to deaf and hard of hearing individuals, including himself, who come into contact and interact with the HPD, thereby discriminating against them. Plaintiffs also bring this complaint because of the failure on the part of the CITY, HPD, DOES 1 through 10 (collectively “DEFENDANTS”) to properly supervise and train their officers and other employees to effectively communicate with individuals who are deaf and hard of hearing during investigation, arrest, booking, interrogation, and while otherwise in HPD's custody or otherwise interacting with HPD, in violation of federal and state law.

1           3.     During the early evening of February 13, 2013, HPD officers confronted  
2 Mr. Meister as he was removing his own property from the backyard of a friend's home,  
3 with the friend's consent. The officers either failed to recognize that Mr. Meister is deaf,  
4 cannot hear, and/or failed to take into account that he communicates primarily using  
5 American Sign Language, a complete, complex language that employs signs made by  
6 moving the hands combined with facial expressions and postures of the body. The HPD  
7 officers shot taser darts into Mr. Meister, administered a number of painful electric  
8 shocks, struck him with fists and feet, and forcibly took him to the ground. The officers  
9 then arrested Mr. Meister allegedly for assaulting them.

10           4.     This incident occurred in substantial part because the HPD does not provide  
11 its officers the training and resources to serve people who are deaf or hard of hearing,  
12 including those who communicate primarily through American Sign Language. Mr.  
13 Meister's injuries were, in part, the result of Defendants' failure to adopt and implement  
14 policies and procedures to ensure that communications with individuals who are deaf  
15 and hard of hearing are as effective as communications with others during law  
16 enforcement interactions, as well as the HPD's general deliberate indifference to the  
17 behavior of its officers during their interaction with members of the public.

18           5.     Mr. Meister, who communicates primarily through American Sign  
19 Language, alleges that HPD officers failed to take appropriate steps to communicate  
20 effectively with him or furnish appropriate auxiliary aids throughout the course of  
21 HPD's confrontation with including their initial contact, interrogations in the field, arrest  
22 and detention, including transporting him to the station, at the station and subsequent  
23 release. He was never provided with any appropriate auxiliary aids which resulted in  
24 HPD's failure to effectively communicate with him in violation of federal and state law.  
25 Plaintiffs further allege that HPD does not train or supervise their officers and  
26 employees to provide hard of hearing or deaf individuals with effective communication,  
27  
28

1 such as qualified sign language interpreters, when necessary to effectively communicate  
2 with hard of hearing or deaf individuals.

3 6. Plaintiffs therefore bring this action seeking declaratory and injunctive  
4 relief to compel the HPD to adopt policies, procedures and training to officers to ensure  
5 that appropriate auxiliary aids and services are provided to individuals who are deaf and  
6 hard of hearing where necessary to ensure effective communication.

7 7. Plaintiffs also seek compensatory, statutory, punitive damages (where  
8 permitted), attorneys' fees and costs.

### 9 **PARTIES**

10 8. Plaintiff JONATHAN MEISTER ("Mr. Meister") is an adult qualified to  
11 bring suit. He is profoundly deaf, and therefore substantially limited in the major life  
12 activities of hearing and speaking. Mr. Meister is, and at all times relevant herein was, a  
13 qualified person with a "disability" as that term is defined under the ADA and its  
14 implementing regulations (42 U.S.C. § 12102; 28 C.F.R. § 36.104), Section 504 and its  
15 implementing regulations (29 U.S.C. § 705(20)(A); 28 C.F.R. 41.32(b)), and California  
16 law (Cal. Gov't Code § 12926). Mr. Meister is, and at all times relevant herein was a  
17 resident of the State of California.

18 9. Plaintiff GREATER LOS ANGELES AGENCY ON DEAFNESS, INC.  
19 ("GLAD") is a nationally recognized advocacy and service agency addressing the needs  
20 of the deaf and hard of hearing population. GLAD's mission is to ensure equal access of  
21 the deaf and hard of hearing community to the same opportunities afforded their hearing  
22 counterparts. The organization's general purposes and powers are directed around the  
23 promotion of the social, recreational, cultural, educational, and vocational well-being of  
24 its deaf and hard of hearing constituents.

25 10. GLAD's specific and primary purpose is to act as a coordinating agency  
26 that addresses the broad social service needs of deaf and hard of hearing people through  
27 direct service provision, advocacy, research and dissemination of information regarding  
28

1 deafness to parents, professionals and consumers. For over 43 years, GLAD has been  
2 improving the lives of the deaf and hard of hearing community, proudly serving 10  
3 counties throughout Southern California: Los Angeles, Kern, Orange, Ventura, Santa  
4 Barbara, Riverside, San Luis Obispo, San Bernardino, Inyo and Mono. GLAD is  
5 committed to the philosophy “of, by, for and with the deaf and hard of hearing.”

6 11. GLAD’s constituents and the individuals that it serves are “qualified  
7 individuals with a disability” within the meaning of all applicable statutes including 42  
8 U.S.C. § 12131(2) and Cal. Gov’t Code § 12926.

9 12. GLAD is qualified to represent the interests of its constituents in this  
10 lawsuit because:

11 a. Those constituents would otherwise have standing to sue in their own  
12 right;

13 b. GLAD’s interest to ensure non-discriminatory access to government  
14 programs, services and activities, including non-discriminatory law enforcement  
15 procedures, for its constituents is germane to its purpose as an organization; and

16 c. Neither the claims asserted nor the relief requested through this  
17 lawsuit require the participation of GLAD’s individual constituents.

18 13. GLAD has also experienced harm including economic loss due to diversion  
19 of their resources and a frustration of mission, and has independent standing to challenge  
20 Defendants’ discriminatory acts and omissions as alleged herein.

21 14. Defendant CITY OF HAWTHORNE (“CITY”) is a local government and  
22 public entity within the meaning of Title II of the ADA, and receives federal funding  
23 within the meaning of the Rehabilitation Act.

24 15. Defendant HAWTHORNE POLICE DEPARTMENT (“HPD”) is a local  
25 government entity and an agency of Defendant CITY independently subject to suit. It is  
26 a public entity within the meaning of Title II of the ADA, and on information and belief  
27 receives federal funding within the meaning of the Rehabilitation Act. The CITY  
28

1 provides funding to and oversight of Defendant HPD. The HPD is responsible for the  
2 acts herein.

3 16. Defendant ROBERT D. FAGER is the Chief of Police for the City of  
4 Hawthorne. He is sued both in his individual and his official capacity. In doing the acts  
5 alleged herein he acted within the scope of his employment and under color of state law.

6 17. Defendant JEFFREY SALMON is, and at all times relevant hereto was, an  
7 HPD Police Officer. In doing the acts alleged herein he acted within the scope of his  
8 employment and under color of state law.

9 18. Defendant JEFFREY TYSL is, and at all times relevant hereto was, an HPD  
10 Police Officer. In doing the acts alleged herein he acted within the scope of his  
11 employment and under color of state law.

12 19. Defendant ERICA BRISTOW is, and at all times relevant hereto was, an  
13 HPD Police Officer. In doing the acts alleged herein she acted within the scope of her  
14 employment and under color of state law.

15 20. Defendant MARK HULTGREN is, and at all times relevant hereto was, an  
16 HPD Police Officer. In doing the acts alleged herein he acted within the scope of his  
17 employment and under color of state law.

18 21. Under California Government Code § 815(a), Defendants are liable for any  
19 and all wrongful acts in violation of state law hereinafter complained of committed by  
20 any of these Defendants' employees acting within the course and scope of their  
21 employment.

22 22. Plaintiffs are currently unaware of the true names and identities of DOE  
23 Defendants 1-10 and therefore sue those Defendants by these fictitious names.  
24 Plaintiffs will amend their Complaint to allege the DOE Defendants' legal names and  
25 capacities as soon as such information is ascertained. Plaintiffs are informed and  
26 believe, and, based thereon allege, that all times herein mentioned each and every  
27  
28

1 Defendant was the agent, servant, employee, co-conspirator, and/or representative of  
2 each and every other Defendant and was, in doing the things complained of herein,  
3 acting within the scope of said agency, service, employment, conspiracy, and/or  
4 representation, and that each and every Defendant was acting within his/her actual or  
5 apparent authority with the full knowledge and consent of each other Defendant.

### 6 **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

7 23. Jonathan Meister is a graduate of Ohio State University with a master's  
8 degree in architecture. He is employed professionally.

9 24. Prior to February 13, 2013, Mr. Meister had never been arrested.

10 25. Mr. Meister, shortly before this incident, shared a residence with two  
11 brothers, Daniel and David Gavrilovic. They moved to separate residences after the  
12 Gavrilovic brothers bought the home located at 3559 West 147th Street in the City of  
13 Hawthorne.

14 26. Because there was repair and renovation work being done inside the home  
15 at 3559 West 147th Street home on February 13, 2013, the Gavrilovic brothers stored  
16 belongings on the back porch, accessible through a gate, but within a walled-in back  
17 yard. Mr. Meister had some of his personal property stored there as well.

18 27. Mr. Meister had made plans to visit family and go snowboarding in Utah,  
19 and had a plane reservation for the morning of February 14, 2013. He made  
20 arrangements with Daniel Gavrilovic to pick up his snowboard and winter clothes, and  
21 some other property of his mixed in with the Gavrilovic brothers' belongings on the  
22 back porch at the 147th Street address. Daniel was not planning to be there at the time,  
23 but it made no difference because Mr. Meister knew he could hop over a low fence  
24 (about four feet high), go through the gate that Daniel was leaving unlocked for him, and  
25 retrieve his belongings from the porch.

26 28. Mr. Meister went by the Gavrilovic's 147th Street home around 6:30 p.m.,  
27 just as it was getting dark, so there would still be some light available, and he would still  
28

1 have time to attend his regular Bible study class. While he was going through boxes on  
2 the back porch, on information and belief, one or more concerned neighbors looked over  
3 the wall and called out to him. Mr. Meister did not respond. He could not see them  
4 because he was facing away and could not hear them because he is profoundly deaf.

5 29. The HPD was called to investigate what were mistakenly, but  
6 understandably, perceived as “suspicious circumstances.”

7 30. HPD officers Jeffrey Salmon and Jeffrey Tysl arrived first. They watched  
8 Mr. Meister as he walked through the gate, out of the backyard, carrying some of his  
9 personal belongings to his car. When Mr. Meister saw the officers, he put his belongings  
10 down and, while still standing in the yard, behind the low fence, attempted to convey  
11 that he cannot hear by gesturing to his ear. Mr. Meister, like many other people who are  
12 deaf or hard of hearing, communicates primarily in ASL and does not speak effectively.  
13 He requires extra space for hand and arm gestures to communicate, especially when the  
14 people with whom he is trying to communicate are not familiar with sign language.

15 31. Mr. Meister understood the body language of Officers Salmon and Tysl as  
16 directing that Mr. Meister come to their side of the fence, and that there would be no  
17 problem if he did so. Mr. Meister trusted that the officers understood that he was deaf.

18 32. Following the officers’ instructions, Mr. Meister left his friends’ private  
19 property – where he had permission to be – and hopped the low fence, onto the sidewalk.  
20 Next he walked over to the officers, as they were directing him to do, all the while trying  
21 to explain with calm hand gestures what was going on.

22 33. Before Mr. Meister could communicate his reasons for being at the  
23 Gavrilovic’s home, however, Officers Salmon and Tysl grabbed Mr. Meister’s wrists  
24 and turned him around so that he could not see them. Because he is deaf, Mr. Meister  
25 depends on using his hands while facing a person to communicate. The officers’ sudden  
26 aggression, which both caused pain and interfered with his ability to communicate,  
27 caused Mr. Meister reflexively to pull his hands away, hop back over the fence, and step  
28

1 toward the gate. He was not resisting in any way, he only wanted to create some space  
2 so that he could communicate with his hands while facing the officers because he did not  
3 have his cell phone, which he usually uses to communicate, on his person at that  
4 moment. The officers jumped over the low fence themselves -- one falling on his face in  
5 the process -- grabbed Mr. Meister and pushed him up against a wall.

6 34. According to the officers' reports, Officer Salmon tried to put a potentially  
7 lethal carotid choke hold around Mr. Meister's neck, and after being unable to do so,  
8 kned him twice in the abdomen.

9 35. Officers Salmon and Tysl then grabbed Mr. Meister's arms and shoved him  
10 against the Gavrilovics' locked-up car parked in the driveway.

11 36. At some point, HPD officers Erica Bristow and Mark Hultgren joined the  
12 beating of Mr. Meister. After being unable to pull Mr. Meister to the ground (Mr.  
13 Meister played club rugby at Ohio State and instinctively tries to stay on his feet when  
14 being tackled), Office Tysl punched him in the face repeatedly while Officer Salmon  
15 shot darts from a TASER Model X26 electrical control device into Mr. Meister's left  
16 side, causing five seconds of rapidly pulsing electrical shocks. Officer Salmon reported  
17 that the X26 current had the desired result and Mr. Meister fell face down.

18 37. While Mr. Meister was on the ground, Officer Salmon kicked Mr. Meister  
19 four times in the stomach, and Officer Hultgren kicked Mr. Meister twice more in the  
20 side. Officer Tysl elbowed Mr. Meister in the face repeatedly, Officer Bristow picked up  
21 the X26 (which Officer Salmon had dropped) and delivered several more shocks.

22 38. Officer Salmon kneeled on Mr. Meister's back, using body weight to push  
23 him into the ground. Officer Salmon then took the X26 back from Officer Bristow, and  
24 pulled the trigger to give Mr. Meister another excruciatingly painful five seconds of  
25 punishing shocks.

26 39. Officer Hultgen pulled out a second X26 and "drive stunned" Mr. Meister  
27 repeatedly, deliberately burning his flesh with electrical current, while Officer Tysl put  
28

1 Mr. Meister into a second carotid choke hold and knocked him unconscious. Mr. Meister  
2 was then handcuffed and placed under arrest for assaulting the police officers.

3 40. Other officers took Mr. Meister to get medical treatment.

4 41. After receiving medical clearance, Mr. Meister was taken to the police  
5 station, where he was finally provided the opportunity to communicate in writing and  
6 was provided his cell phone so that he could text for help. He was told that he would be  
7 held on \$20,000 bail, but was later cited and released.

8 42. Mr. Meister had to appear in court on more than one occasion. Eventually  
9 the charges were dismissed.

10 43. Mr. Meister contends, based on the foregoing, that the City of Hawthorne,  
11 the HPD, and its employees and agents, acting under color of law and within the course  
12 and scope of their employment, violated his civil rights and subjected him to various  
13 common-law and statutory torts, all of which subject the City, the HPD and the involved  
14 employees to personal and vicarious liability.

15 44. Plaintiffs Meister and GLAD are informed, believe, and thereon allege that  
16 Defendants have failed and continue to fail to:

17 a. Take appropriate steps to ensure that communication with individuals  
18 who are deaf or hard of hearing is as effective as communications with others;

19 b. Provide appropriate auxiliary aids and services;

20 c. Give primary consideration to the type of auxiliary aids requested by  
21 individuals who are deaf or hard of hearing; and

22 d. Ensure that individuals who are deaf or hard of hearing can obtain  
23 information as to the existence and location of accessible services, activities, and  
24 facilities.

25 45. Plaintiffs Meister and GLAD are informed, believe, and thereon allege that  
26 Defendants CITY and HPD have not adopted and do not enforce appropriate policies  
27 and procedures to ensure that HPD takes appropriate steps to:

- a. Ensure that communication with individuals who are deaf or hard of hearing is as effective as communications with others;
- b. Provides appropriate auxiliary aids and services;
- c. Give primary consideration to the type of auxiliary aids requested by individuals who are deaf or hard of hearing; and
- d. Ensure that these persons can obtain information as to the existence and location of accessible services, activities, and facilities.

46. Plaintiffs Meister and GLAD are informed, believe, and thereon allege that Defendants CITY and HPD have failed and continue to fail to provide HPD officers and employees with appropriate training regarding the right of individuals who are deaf or hard of hearing under the ADA and Section 504 and state disability rights laws.

47. Defendants' acts and omissions, as herein described, were intentional, knowing, willful, wanton, malicious and/or recklessly in disregard for Plaintiffs federally protected and state protected rights.

48. Plaintiffs were deprived of an interest protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States and the State of California, and Defendants caused such deprivation while acting under color of state law.

49. As the result of Defendants' acts and omissions, as herein described, Plaintiffs were, and will continue to be denied full and equal access to the programs, services and activities offered to members of the public by HPD, and have suffered discrimination, extreme physical pain and suffering, humiliation, hardship, anxiety, and indignity, and severe mental and emotional anguish pain, all to their damage.

50. An actual and substantial controversy currently exists between Plaintiffs and Defendants as to their respective legal rights and duties. Accordingly, declaratory relief pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2201 is appropriate.

51. The violations of the ADA and Section 504 and related state statutes as set forth herein, if not enjoined by this Court, will continue to afflict Plaintiffs and similarly

1 situated persons and cause them to suffer irreparable physical and emotional harm  
 2 unnecessarily. Plaintiffs have no plain, speedy, and adequate remedy at law for such an  
 3 injury. Accordingly, injunctive relief pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12133, 29 U.S.C. § 794(a)  
 4 and other authority is appropriate.

5 52. In addition to declaratory and injunctive relief, Plaintiff Meister claims  
 6 damages for his physical and emotional injuries, punitive damages against the involved  
 7 individuals, statutory damages as appropriate, and attorneys' fees and costs.

### 8 **GOVERNMENT CLAIM FILED**

9 53. Plaintiff Meister timely filed a claim pursuant to § 910 et seq. of the  
 10 California Government Code with the City on August 10, 2013. On October 9, 2013, a  
 11 notice was issued to Plaintiff Meister informing him that his claim had been denied at a  
 12 meeting of the Hawthorne City Council on September 24, 2013.

### 13 **FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF** 14 **Violation of Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act** 15 **(42 U.S.C. § 12131 et seq.)** 16 **(Plaintiffs against Defendants HPD and CITY)**

17 54. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference each and every allegation contained in  
 18 the foregoing paragraphs.

19 55. Congress enacted the ADA upon finding, among other things, that "society  
 20 has tended to isolate and segregate individuals with disabilities" and that such forms for  
 21 discrimination continue to be "serious and pervasive social problem." 42 U.S.C. §  
 22 12101(a)(2).

23 56. In response to these findings, Congress explicitly stated that the purpose of  
 24 the ADA is to provide "a clear and comprehensive national mandate for the elimination  
 25 of discrimination against individuals with disabilities" and "clear, strong, consistent,  
 26 enforceable standards addressing discrimination against individuals with disabilities."  
 27 42 U.S.C. § 12101(b)(1) (2).

1           57. Title II of the ADA provides in pertinent part: “[N]o qualified individual  
2 with a disability shall, by reason of such disability, be excluded from participation in or  
3 be denied the benefits of the services, programs, or activities of a public entity, or be  
4 subjected to discrimination by any such entity.” 42 U.S.C. § 12132.

5           58. The U.S. Department of Justice’s regulations implementing Title II, 28  
6 C.F.R. § 35.160, require public entities to:

7           a. Take appropriate steps to ensure that communications with members  
8 of the public with disabilities are as effective as communications with others;

9           b. Furnish appropriate auxiliary aids and services (including qualified  
10 sign language interpreters) where necessary to afford an individual with a  
11 disability an equal opportunity to enjoy the benefits of a service, program, or  
12 activity conducted by the public entity; and

13           c. In determining what type of auxiliary aid and service is necessary, a  
14 public entity shall give primary consideration to the requests of the individual with  
15 a disability.  
16

17           59. At 28 C.F.R. § 35.163(b), the regulations also require public entities to  
18 ensure that persons who are deaf or are hard of hearing can obtain information as to the  
19 existence and location of accessible, services, activities, and facilities.

20           60. At all times relevant to this action, Defendants were public entities within  
21 the meaning of Title II of the ADA and provided a program, service, or activity to the  
22 general public.

23           61. At all times relevant to this action, Plaintiffs were qualified individuals with  
24 a disability within the meaning of Title II of the ADA and met the essential eligibility  
25 requirements for the receipt of the services, programs, or activities of Defendants.

26           62. Through the acts and omissions of Defendants and their agents and  
27 employees described herein, Defendants have subjected Plaintiffs to discrimination on  
28

1 the basis of disability in violation of Title II of the ADA by failing to provide them with  
2 communication that is as effective as communication provided to the general public  
3 during the course of law enforcement interactions including but not limited to  
4 investigation; arrest; transportation; booking, questioning and interrogation at the  
5 station; and/or while otherwise in DEFENDANTS custody.

6 63. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that DEFENDANTS and  
7 their agents and employees could have reasonably provided him with one or more of the  
8 following auxiliary aids and services in order to effectively communicate with him:

- 9 a. A qualified sign language interpreter at the scene of the investigation;  
10 b. A qualified sign language interpreter during the arrest;  
11 c. A qualified sign language interpreter informing Plaintiff of the reason for his  
12 arrest and his *Miranda* rights;  
13 d. A qualified sign language interpreter during his booking;  
14 e. A qualified sign language interpreter during questioning and interrogation;  
15 f. A qualified sign language interpreter while held in custody; and/or  
16 g. A Telecommunication Device for the Deaf (TDD), Video Relay Service or  
17 equally effective telecommunication system while held in custody.

18 64. PLAINTIFFS are informed, believe, and thereon allege that  
19 DEFENDANTS and their agents and employees have failed and continue to fail to:  
20

- 21 a. Adopt and enforce additional policies and procedures for  
22 communicating effectively with individuals who are deaf or hard of  
23 hearing;  
24 b. Train and supervise HPD officers and employees to communicate  
25 effectively with individuals who are deaf or hard of hearing; and  
26 c. Train and supervise HPD officers and employees regarding the culture  
27 and behavior of individual who are deaf or hard of hearing.  
28

1 Because DEFENDANTS' discriminatory conduct is ongoing, declaratory and injunctive  
2 relief are appropriate remedies.

3 65. Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §§ 12133 and 12205, Plaintiffs pray for judgment as  
4 set forth below.

5  
6 **SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF**  
7 **Violation of Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973**  
8 **(29 U.S.C. § 794)**  
9 **(Plaintiffs against Defendants HPD and CITY)**

10 66. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference each and every allegation contained in  
11 the foregoing paragraphs.

12 67. Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 provides in pertinent part:  
13 “[N]o otherwise qualified individual with a disability. . . shall, solely by reason of her or  
14 his disability, be excluded from the participation in, be denied the benefits, or be  
15 subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal financial  
16 assistance . . .” 29 U.S.C. § 794.

17 68. Plaintiffs were at all times relevant herein qualified individuals with  
18 disabilities within the meaning of the Rehabilitation Act because they have physical  
19 impairments that substantially limits one or more of their major life activities. See 29  
20 U.S.C. § 705(20)(B).

21 69. At all times relevant to this action Defendants were recipients of federal  
22 funding within the meaning of the Rehabilitation Act.

23 70. Through their acts and omissions described herein, Defendants have  
24 violated the Rehabilitation Act by excluding Plaintiffs from participation in, by denying  
25 them the benefits of, and subjecting them to discrimination in the benefits and services  
26 Defendants provide to the general public.

1           71. Pursuant to the remedies, procedures, and rights set forth in 29 U.S.C. §  
2 794(a), Plaintiffs pray for judgment as set forth below.

3  
4                           **THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF**  
5                           **Violation of Cal. Gov't Code § 11135**  
6                           **(Plaintiffs against Defendants HPD and CITY)**

7           72. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference each and every allegation contained in  
8 the foregoing paragraphs.

9           73. Section 11135(a) of the California Government Code provides in pertinent  
10 part: "No person in the State of California shall, on the basis of... disability, be  
11 unlawfully denied the benefits of, or be unlawfully subjected to discrimination under,  
12 any program or activity that is funded directly by the state or receives any financial  
13 assistance from the state." Cal. Gov't Code § 11135(a).

14           74. A violation of Title II of the ADA is a violation of Cal. Gov't Code  
15 § 11135(b).

16           75. At all times relevant to this action, Defendants received financial  
17 assistance from the state of California.

18           76. Defendants' acts and omissions, as described herein, have excluded and/or  
19 denied Plaintiffs the benefit of and/or participation in the programs, services and  
20 activities they offer to the general public, thereby violating Plaintiffs' rights under Cal.  
21 Gov. Code § 11135.

22           77. Pursuant to the remedies, procedures, and right set forth in 42 U.S.C.  
23 §§ 12133 and 12205, Plaintiffs pray for judgment as set forth below.

24                           **FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**  
25                           **Deprivation Of Civil Rights -- Individual Liability**  
26                           **(42 U.S.C. § 1983)**  
27                           **(Plaintiff Meister against Defendants Salmon, Tysl, Bristow, Hultgren and Does)**

28           78. Plaintiff Meister incorporates by reference each and every allegation  
contained in the foregoing paragraphs.

1           79. Defendants Salmon, Tysl, Bristow and Hultgren and Does 1 through 10,  
2 while acting under color of law, deprived Plaintiff of his civil rights by violating his  
3 rights under the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments to be secure in his person and free  
4 from excessive force, false arrest and imprisonment, and malicious prosecution.

5           80. The above acts and omissions, while carried out under color of law, have  
6 no justification or excuse in law, and instead constitute a gross abuse of governmental  
7 authority and power, shock the conscience, are fundamentally unfair, arbitrary and  
8 oppressive, and unrelated to any activity in which governmental officers may  
9 appropriately and legally undertake in the course of protecting persons or property, or  
10 ensuring civil order. The above acts and omissions were consciously chosen from  
11 among various alternatives.

12           81. As a direct and proximate result of the aforesaid acts, omissions, customs,  
13 practices, policies and decisions of the aforementioned defendants, Plaintiff was injured  
14 in his health and person. He suffered and will continue to suffer great mental and  
15 physical pain, suffering, anguish, fright, nervousness, anxiety, shock, humiliation,  
16 indignity, embarrassment, harm to reputation, and apprehension, which have caused  
17 Plaintiff to sustain damages in a sum to be determined at trial.

18           82. As a further direct and proximate result of the aforesaid acts, omissions,  
19 customs, practices, policies and decisions of the aforementioned defendants Plaintiff  
20 suffered past and future losses of income which have caused Plaintiff to sustain  
21 damages in a sum to be determined at trial.

22           83. As a further direct and proximate result of the aforesaid acts, omissions,  
23 customs, practices, policies and decisions of the aforementioned defendants, Plaintiff  
24 incurred medical expenses, and will incur future medical expenses, which have caused  
25 Plaintiff to sustain damages in a sum to be determined at trial.

26           84. As a further direct and proximate result of the aforesaid acts, omissions,  
27 customs, practices, policies and decisions of the aforementioned defendants, Plaintiff  
28

1 was taken to jail and had to respond to criminal court proceedings where he could have  
2 theoretically been convicted of a crime and sentenced to jail.

3 85. The above mentioned individually named and Doe defendants, acted under  
4 color of law, and both separately and in concert. The aforementioned acts of those  
5 defendants, and each of them, were willful, wanton, malicious and oppressive, with  
6 reckless disregard or with deliberate indifference and with the intent to deprive Plaintiff  
7 of his constitutional rights and privileges, and did in fact violate the aforementioned  
8 rights and privileges, entitling Plaintiff to exemplary and punitive damages in an  
9 amount to be proven at the trial of this matter.

10  
11 **FIFTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**  
12 **Deprivation Of Civil Rights -- Entity and Supervisory Liability**  
13 **(42 U.S.C. § 1983)**  
14 **(Plaintiff Meister against HPD, CITY and FAGER)**

15 86. Plaintiff Meister incorporates by reference each and every allegation  
16 contained in the foregoing paragraphs.

17 87. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that, at all times  
18 herein mentioned, defendants HPD, CITY and FAGER, with deliberate indifference,  
19 and conscious and reckless disregard to the safety, security and constitutional and  
20 statutory rights of Plaintiff, including the right to be free from unreasonable seizures,  
21 excessive force and malicious prosecution under the Fourth Amendment, and the right  
22 to procedural and substantive due process and equal protection under the Fourteenth  
23 Amendment, maintained, enforced, tolerated, ratified, permitted, acquiesced in, and/or  
24 applied, among others, the following policies, practices and customs:

25 a. Failing to adequately train, supervise, and control their officers in  
26 uses of force;

27 b. Failing to adequately train, supervise, and control their officers in  
28 proper communication and appropriate responses to members of the public;

1 c. Failing to set up systems to prevent abuse by officers including the  
2 failure to properly investigate uses of force;

3 d. Failing to discipline officers involved in abusing their authority; and

4 e. Condoning and encouraging their officers in the belief that they can  
5 violate the rights of persons such as the Plaintiff in this action with impunity, and  
6 that such conduct will not adversely affect their opportunities for promotion and  
7 other employment benefits.

8 88. As a direct and proximate result of the aforesaid acts, omissions, customs,  
9 practices, policies and decisions of the aforementioned defendants, Plaintiff was injured  
10 in his health and person. He suffered and will continue to suffer great mental and  
11 physical pain, suffering, anguish, fright, nervousness, anxiety, shock, humiliation,  
12 indignity, embarrassment, harm to reputation, and apprehension, which have caused  
13 Plaintiff to sustain damages in a sum to be determined at trial.

14 89. As a further direct and proximate result of the aforesaid acts, omissions,  
15 customs, practices, policies and decisions of the aforementioned defendants Plaintiff  
16 suffered past and future losses of income which have caused Plaintiff to sustain  
17 damages in a sum to be determined at trial.

18 90. As a further direct and proximate result of the aforesaid acts, omissions,  
19 customs, practices, policies and decisions of the aforementioned defendants, Plaintiff  
20 incurred medical expenses, and will incur future medical expenses, which have caused  
21 Plaintiff to sustain damages in a sum to be determined at trial.

22 91. As a further direct and proximate result of the aforesaid acts, omissions,  
23 customs, practices, policies and decisions of the aforementioned defendants, Plaintiff  
24 was taken to jail and had to respond to criminal court proceedings where he could have  
25 theoretically been convicted of a crime and sentenced to jail.

26 92. The aforementioned actions of FAGER, both separately and in concert  
27 with the individual and doe defendants, were willful, wanton, malicious and oppressive,  
28

1 with reckless disregard or with deliberate indifference and with the intent to deprive  
 2 Plaintiff of his constitutional rights and privileges, and did in fact violate the  
 3 aforementioned rights and privileges, entitling Plaintiff to exemplary and punitive  
 4 damages against FAGER in an amount to be proven at the trial of this matter.

5  
 6 **SIXTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**  
**Deprivation of Civil Rights**  
 7 **(Cal. Civ. Code §§ 51, 51.7, 52, 52.1, 54, 54.1, and 54.3)**  
 8 **(Plaintiff Meister against all Defendants)**

9 93. Plaintiff Meister incorporates by reference each and every allegation  
 10 contained in the foregoing paragraphs.

11 94. Defendants provide police services and public safety services to the  
 12 residents and other persons present in the City of Hawthorne. They are prohibited by  
 13 the terms of the Unruh Civil Rights Act, Cal. Civil Code § 51 et seq., from engaging in  
 14 any discrimination against any person suffering from a disability such as deafness. By  
 15 virtue of the conduct alleged above, defendants, and each of them, discriminated against  
 16 and denied equal access to Plaintiff and others similarly situated in violation of Cal.  
 17 Civil Code § 51.

18 95. By using excessive force as described above on Plaintiff, including beating  
 19 with fists and feet, take downs, and repeatedly shocking Plaintiff with a taser,  
 20 Defendants violated Plaintiff's "right to be free from any violence, or intimidation by  
 21 threat of violence, committed against their persons or property because of" his  
 22 disability in violation of Cal. Civ. Code § 51.7.

23 96. The United States Constitution, Amend. IV, and the California  
 24 Constitution, Art. I § 13, guarantee the right of persons to be free from excessive force  
 25 and seizure without probable cause. Defendants, by engaging in the wrongful conduct  
 26 alleged herein, denied these right to Plaintiff, thus giving rise to claims for damages  
 27 pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code § 52.1.  
 28

1           97. As a direct and proximate cause of the aforementioned acts of Defendants,  
2 Plaintiff was injured as set forth above, and is entitled to statutory damages under Cal.  
3 Civ. Code § 52, as well as compensatory and punitive damages according to proof.

4           98. Based on the foregoing allegations, Defendants violated the rights  
5 guaranteed to Plaintiff by Cal. Civil Code §§ 54 and 54.1 and Defendants are thereby  
6 liable for treble actual damages provided by Cal. Civil Code § 54.3.

7           99. As a direct and proximate result of the aforesaid acts, omissions, customs,  
8 practices, policies and decisions of the aforementioned defendants, Plaintiff was injured  
9 in his health and person. He suffered and will continue to suffer great mental and  
10 physical pain, suffering, anguish, fright, nervousness, anxiety, shock, humiliation,  
11 indignity, embarrassment, harm to reputation, and apprehension, which have caused  
12 Plaintiff to sustain damages in a sum to be determined at trial.

13           100. As a further direct and proximate result of the aforesaid acts, omissions,  
14 customs, practices, policies and decisions of the aforementioned defendants Plaintiff  
15 suffered past and future losses of income which have caused Plaintiff to sustain  
16 damages in a sum to be determined at trial.

17           101. As a further direct and proximate result of the aforesaid acts, omissions,  
18 customs, practices, policies and decisions of the aforementioned defendants, Plaintiff  
19 incurred medical expenses, and will incur future medical expenses, which have caused  
20 Plaintiff to sustain damages in a sum to be determined at trial.

21           102. As a further direct and proximate result of the aforesaid acts, omissions,  
22 customs, practices, policies and decisions of the aforementioned defendants, Plaintiff  
23 was taken to jail and had to respond to criminal court proceedings where he could have  
24 theoretically been convicted of a crime and sentenced to jail.

25           103. The above mentioned individually named and Doe defendants, excluding  
26 defendants CITY, HPD acted under color of law, and both separately and in concert.  
27 The aforementioned acts of those defendants, and each of them, were willful, wanton,  
28

malicious and oppressive, with reckless disregard or with deliberate indifference and with the intent to deprive Plaintiff of his constitutional rights and privileges, and did in fact violate the aforementioned rights and privileges, entitling Plaintiff to exemplary and punitive damages in an amount to be proven at the trial of this matter.

### **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFFS request judgment as follows:

1. A declaration that Defendants' conduct as alleged herein violated and continues to violate Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, and California Government Code § 11135.
2. An injunction against HPD and/or the CITY including but not limited to the following:
  - a. Implementation of policies and procedures that ensure that HPD personnel have access to qualified sign language interpreters on an on call, twenty four hours, seven days a week basis, and should be able to summon qualified sign language interpreter within forty five minutes of making the request. Additionally, HPD personnel training should include instruction that enlisting the aid of personnel with limited use of sign language who are not qualified interpreters, is likely to result in ineffective communication with people who are deaf or hard of hearing.
  - b. Implementation of policies and procedures to inform individuals who are deaf or hard of hearing of the availability of auxiliary aids and services, including but not limited to the provision of a qualified sign language interpreter. These policies should be posted in HPD stations and offices.
  - c. HPD shall revise and/or update its training and supervision programs to educate its officers and employees about providing effective communication and auxiliary aids to persons who are deaf or hard of hearing consistent with ADA and

1 California law to ensure equal access to programs, services, and activities.

2 Training should include but not be limited to the provision of “primary  
3 consideration.” Such training should also include immediate implementation of a  
4 disability sensitivity training for all HPD officers and staff.

- 5 d. HPD will maintain Telecommunication Devices for the Deaf and/or an equally  
6 effective system such as a Video Relay System, at all offices and divisions that  
7 directly interact with the public. Each station shall ensure that all employees  
8 receiving phone calls from the public, and/or facilitating outgoing phone calls by  
9 persons who are deaf or hard of hearing, receive training and/or instruction on the  
10 use of TDDs.
- 11 e. Implementation of policies and procedures to allow individuals whose requests for  
12 “effective communication” are not adequately addressed to obtain an adequate  
13 resolution. These policies and procedures should include avenues for redress at  
14 the local (substation) level, as well as at the regional level.
- 15 f. Implementation of any other policies and procedures necessary to prevent  
16 discrimination against individuals with disabilities through the failure to provide  
17 effective communication.
- 18 g. Provision of sufficient documentation on a quarterly basis to plaintiff’s counsel  
19 for three years after resolution to evidence compliance with the above conditions.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

3. Compensatory damages to Plaintiffs according to proof;
4. Statutory damages and treble damages where appropriated;
5. Punitive damages against all individual defendants;
5. Attorneys' fees and costs, as provided by statute; and
6. Such other relief as the Court finds just and proper.

Dated: February 11, 2014

THE LAW OFFICES OF JOHN BURTON  
DISABILITY RIGHTS LEGAL CENTER

By:

JOHN BURTON  
Attorneys for Plaintiffs  
JONATHAN MEISTER  
GREATER LOS ANGELES  
AGENCY ON DEAFNESS

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

Plaintiffs demand trial by jury on all claims subject to trial by jury.

Dated: February 11, 2014

THE LAW OFFICES OF JOHN BURTON  
DISABILITY RIGHTS LEGAL CENTER

By:

JOHN BURTON  
Attorneys for Plaintiffs  
JONATHAN MEISTER  
GREATER LOS ANGELES  
AGENCY ON DEAFNESS

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

NOTICE OF ASSIGNMENT TO UNITED STATES JUDGES

This case has been assigned to District Judge Michael W. Fitzgerald and the assigned  
Magistrate Judge is Stephen J. Hillman.

The case number on all documents filed with the Court should read as follows:

CV14-1096-MWF(SHx)

Pursuant to General Order 05-07 of the United States District Court for the Central District of California, the Magistrate Judge has been designated to hear discovery related motions.

All discovery related motions should be noticed on the calendar of the Magistrate Judge.

Clerk, U. S. District Court

February 12, 2014

Date

By C. Sawyer  
Deputy Clerk

---

NOTICE TO COUNSEL

*A copy of this notice must be served with the summons and complaint on all defendants (if a removal action is filed, a copy of this notice must be served on all plaintiffs).*

**Subsequent documents must be filed at the following location:**

☒ Western Division  
312 N. Spring Street, G-8  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

☐ Southern Division  
411 West Fourth St., Ste 1053  
Santa Ana, CA 92701

☐ Eastern Division  
3470 Twelfth Street, Room 134  
Riverside, CA 92501

**Failure to file at the proper location will result in your documents being returned to you.**

ORIGINAL

AO 440 (Rev. 06/12) Summons in a Civil Action

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

Central District of California ☒

JONATHAN MEISTER, an individual, and )  
 GREATER LOS ANGELES AGENCY ON )  
 DEAFNESS, INC., )

Plaintiff(s)

CITY OF HAWTHORNE; HAWTHORNE POLICE )  
 DEPARTMENT; ROBERT D. FAGER, Individually )  
 and in his Official Capacity as the )  
 Chief of Police; (continued) )

Defendant(s)

CV14-1096 MWF(SHX)

Civil Action No.

## SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION

To: (Defendant's name and address)

A lawsuit has been filed against you.

Within 21 days after service of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you are the United States or a United States agency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney, whose name and address are:

John Burton  
 THE LAW OFFICES OF JOHN BURTON  
 4 East Holly Street, Suite 201  
 Pasadena, California 91103

If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You also must file your answer or motion with the court.

Date:

2-12-14

CLERK OF COURT



Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

1149

AO 440 (Rev. 06/12) Summons in a Civil Action (Page 2)

Civil Action No. \_\_\_\_\_

**PROOF OF SERVICE***(This section should not be filed with the court unless required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 (l))*

This summons for *(name of individual and title, if any)* \_\_\_\_\_  
 was received by me on *(date)* \_\_\_\_\_.

☐ I personally served the summons on the individual at *(place)* \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_ on *(date)* \_\_\_\_\_; or

☐ I left the summons at the individual's residence or usual place of abode with *(name)* \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_, a person of suitable age and discretion who resides there,  
 on *(date)* \_\_\_\_\_, and mailed a copy to the individual's last known address; or

☐ I served the summons on *(name of individual)* \_\_\_\_\_, who is  
 designated by law to accept service of process on behalf of *(name of organization)* \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_ on *(date)* \_\_\_\_\_; or

☐ I returned the summons unexecuted because \_\_\_\_\_; or

☐ Other *(specify)*: \_\_\_\_\_

My fees are \$ \_\_\_\_\_ for travel and \$ \_\_\_\_\_ for services, for a total of \$ 0.00.

I declare under penalty of perjury that this information is true.

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Server's signature*

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Printed name and title*

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Server's address*

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:

ATTACHMENT TO SUMMONS

*(Defendants continued)*

Officer JEFFREY SALMON; Officer  
JEFFREY TYSL; Officer ERICA BRISTOW;  
Officer MARK HULTGREN and  
DOES 1-10, Inclusive.

Defendants.

COPY

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
CIVIL COVER SHEET**

**I. (a) PLAINTIFFS** ( Check box if you are representing yourself ☐ )

Jonathan Meister, an individual, and Greater Los Angeles Agency on Deafness, Inc.

**DEFENDANTS** ( Check box if you are representing yourself ☐ )(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Los Angeles

(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)

County of Residence of First Listed Defendant \_\_\_\_\_

(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)

(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address and Telephone Number) If you are representing yourself, provide the same information.

John Burton, SBN 86029, THE LAW OFFICES OF JOHN BURTON  
4 East Holly Street, Suite 201  
Pasadena, California 91103

Attorneys (Firm Name, Address and Telephone Number) If you are representing yourself, provide the same information.

**II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION** (Place an X in one box only.)

- ☐ 1. U.S. Government Plaintiff
- ☒ 3. Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)
- ☐ 2. U.S. Government Defendant
- ☐ 4. Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)

**III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES**-For Diversity Cases Only  
(Place an X in one box for plaintiff and one for defendant)

- |   |                                |                                |   |                                |                                |
|---|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Citizen of This State                   | PTF <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | DEF <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | Incorporated or Principal Place of Business in this State     | PTF <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | DEF <input type="checkbox"/> 4 |
| Citizen of Another State                | <input type="checkbox"/> 2     | <input type="checkbox"/> 2     | Incorporated and Principal Place of Business in Another State | <input type="checkbox"/> 5     | <input type="checkbox"/> 5     |
| Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country | <input type="checkbox"/> 3     | <input type="checkbox"/> 3     | Foreign Nation  | <input type="checkbox"/> 6     | <input type="checkbox"/> 6     |

**IV. ORIGIN** (Place an X in one box only.)

- ☒ 1. Original Proceeding
- ☐ 2. Removed from State Court
- ☐ 3. Remanded from Appellate Court
- ☐ 4. Reinstated or Reopened
- ☐ 5. Transferred from Another District (Specify) \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ 6. Multi-District Litigation

**V. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: JURY DEMAND:** ☒ Yes ☐ No (Check "Yes" only if demanded in complaint.)**CLASS ACTION under F.R.Cv.P. 23:** ☐ Yes ☒ No☐ **MONEY DEMANDED IN COMPLAINT:** \$ \_\_\_\_\_**VI. CAUSE OF ACTION** (Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing and write a brief statement of cause. Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity.)  
42 U.S.C. Section 1983 - police misconduct**VII. NATURE OF SUIT** (Place an X in one box only).

OTHER STATUTES	CONTRACT	REAL PROPERTY CONT.	IMMIGRATION	PRISONER PETITIONS	PROPERTY RIGHTS
<input type="checkbox"/> 375 False Claims Act	<input type="checkbox"/> 110 Insurance	<input type="checkbox"/> 240 Torts to Land	<input type="checkbox"/> 462 Naturalization Application	<b>Habeas Corpus:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> 820 Copyrights
<input type="checkbox"/> 400 State Reapportionment	<input type="checkbox"/> 120 Marine	<input type="checkbox"/> 245 Tort Product Liability	<input type="checkbox"/> 465 Other Immigration Actions	<input type="checkbox"/> 463 Alien Detainee	<input type="checkbox"/> 830 Patent
<input type="checkbox"/> 410 Antitrust	<input type="checkbox"/> 130 Miller Act	<input type="checkbox"/> 290 All Other Real Property	<b>TORTS</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence	<input type="checkbox"/> 840 Trademark
<input type="checkbox"/> 430 Banks and Banking	<input type="checkbox"/> 140 Negotiable Instrument	<b>TORTS</b>	<b>PERSONAL PROPERTY</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> 530 General	<b>SOCIAL SECURITY</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> 450 Commerce/ICC Rates/Etc.	<input type="checkbox"/> 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment	<input type="checkbox"/> 310 Airplane	<input type="checkbox"/> 370 Other Fraud	<input type="checkbox"/> 535 Death Penalty	<input type="checkbox"/> 861 HIA (1395ff)
<input type="checkbox"/> 460 Deportation	<input type="checkbox"/> 151 Medicare Act	<input type="checkbox"/> 315 Airplane Product Liability	<input type="checkbox"/> 371 Truth in Lending	<b>Other:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> 862 Black Lung (923)
<input type="checkbox"/> 470 Racketeer Influenced & Corrupt Org.	<input type="checkbox"/> 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loan (Excl. Vet.)	<input type="checkbox"/> 320 Assault, Libel & Slander	<input type="checkbox"/> 380 Other Personal Property Damage	<input type="checkbox"/> 540 Mandamus/Other	<input type="checkbox"/> 863 DIWC/DIWW (405 (g))
<input type="checkbox"/> 480 Consumer Credit	<input type="checkbox"/> 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Vet. Benefits	<input type="checkbox"/> 330 Fed. Employers' Liability	<input type="checkbox"/> 385 Property Damage Product Liability	<input type="checkbox"/> 550 Civil Rights	<input type="checkbox"/> 864 SSID Title XVI
<input type="checkbox"/> 490 Cable/Sat TV	<input type="checkbox"/> 160 Stockholders' Suits	<input type="checkbox"/> 340 Marine	<b>BANKRUPTCY</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> 555 Prison Condition	<input type="checkbox"/> 865 RSI (405 (g))
<input type="checkbox"/> 850 Securities/Commodities/Exchange	<input type="checkbox"/> 190 Other Contract	<input type="checkbox"/> 345 Marine Product Liability	<input type="checkbox"/> 422 Appeal 28 USC 158	<input type="checkbox"/> 560 Civil Detainee Conditions of Confinement	<b>FEDERAL TAX SUITS</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> 890 Other Statutory Actions	<input type="checkbox"/> 195 Contract Product Liability	<input type="checkbox"/> 350 Motor Vehicle	<input type="checkbox"/> 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157	<b>FORFEITURE/PENALTY</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant)
<input type="checkbox"/> 891 Agricultural Acts	<input type="checkbox"/> 196 Franchise	<input type="checkbox"/> 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability	<b>CIVIL RIGHTS</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881	<input type="checkbox"/> 871 IRS-Third Party 26 USC 7609
<input type="checkbox"/> 893 Environmental Matters	<b>REAL PROPERTY</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> 360 Other Personal Injury	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 440 Other Civil Rights	<input type="checkbox"/> 690 Other	
<input type="checkbox"/> 895 Freedom of Info. Act	<input type="checkbox"/> 210 Land Condemnation	<input type="checkbox"/> 362 Personal Injury-Med Malpractice	<input type="checkbox"/> 441 Voting	<b>LABOR</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> 896 Arbitration	<input type="checkbox"/> 220 Foreclosure	<input type="checkbox"/> 365 Personal Injury-Product Liability	<input type="checkbox"/> 442 Employment	<input type="checkbox"/> 710 Fair Labor Standards Act	
<input type="checkbox"/> 899 Admin. Procedures Act/Review of Appeal of Agency Decision	<input type="checkbox"/> 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	<input type="checkbox"/> 367 Health Care/Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability	<input type="checkbox"/> 443 Housing/Accommodations	<input type="checkbox"/> 720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations	
<input type="checkbox"/> 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes		<input type="checkbox"/> 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 446 American with Disabilities-Other	<input type="checkbox"/> 740 Railway Labor Act	
			<input type="checkbox"/> 448 Education	<input type="checkbox"/> 751 Family and Medical Leave Act	
				<input type="checkbox"/> 790 Other Labor Litigation	
				<input type="checkbox"/> 791 Employee Ret. Inc. Security Act	

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Case Number:

CV-71 (11/13)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

CV14-1096

Page 1 of 3

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
CIVIL COVER SHEET**

**VIII. VENUE:** Your answers to the questions below will determine the division of the Court to which this case will most likely be initially assigned. This initial assignment is subject to change, in accordance with the Court's General Orders, upon review by the Court of your Complaint or Notice of Removal.

Question A: Was this case removed from state court?	STATE CASE WAS PENDING IN THE COUNTY OF:	INITIAL DIVISION IN CACD IS:
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Los Angeles	Western
If "no," go to Question B. If "yes," check the box to the right that applies, enter the corresponding division in response to Question D, below, and skip to Section IX.	<input type="checkbox"/> Ventura, Santa Barbara, or San Luis Obispo	Western
	<input type="checkbox"/> Orange	Southern
	<input type="checkbox"/> Riverside or San Bernardino	Eastern

Question B: Is the United States, or one of its agencies or employees, a party to this action?	If the United States, or one of its agencies or employees, is a party, is it:		INITIAL DIVISION IN CACD IS:
	A PLAINTIFF?	A DEFENDANT?	
	Then check the box below for the county in which the majority of DEFENDANTS reside.	Then check the box below for the county in which the majority of PLAINTIFFS reside.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No  If "no," go to Question C. If "yes," check the box to the right that applies, enter the corresponding division in response to Question D, below, and skip to Section IX.	<input type="checkbox"/> Los Angeles	<input type="checkbox"/> Los Angeles	Western
	<input type="checkbox"/> Ventura, Santa Barbara, or San Luis Obispo	<input type="checkbox"/> Ventura, Santa Barbara, or San Luis Obispo	Western
	<input type="checkbox"/> Orange	<input type="checkbox"/> Orange	Southern
	<input type="checkbox"/> Riverside or San Bernardino	<input type="checkbox"/> Riverside or San Bernardino	Eastern
	<input type="checkbox"/> Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Other	Western

Question C: Location of plaintiffs, defendants, and claims? (Make only one selection per row)	A. Los Angeles County	B. Ventura, Santa Barbara, or San Luis Obispo Counties	C. Orange County	D. Riverside or San Bernardino Counties	E. Outside the Central District of California	F. Other
Indicate the location in which a majority of plaintiffs reside:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Indicate the location in which a majority of defendants reside:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Indicate the location in which a majority of claims arose:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**C.1. Is either of the following true? If so, check the one that applies:**

- ☐ 2 or more answers in Column C  
☐ only 1 answer in Column C and no answers in Column D

Your case will initially be assigned to the  
SOUTHERN DIVISION.  
Enter "Southern" in response to Question D, below.  
If none applies, answer question C2 to the right. →

**C.2. Is either of the following true? If so, check the one that applies:**

- ☐ 2 or more answers in Column D  
☐ only 1 answer in Column D and no answers in Column C

Your case will initially be assigned to the  
EASTERN DIVISION.  
Enter "Eastern" in response to Question D, below.  
If none applies, go to the box below. ↓

Your case will initially be assigned to the  
WESTERN DIVISION.  
Enter "Western" in response to Question D below.

Question D: Initial Division?	INITIAL DIVISION IN CACD
Enter the initial division determined by Question A, B, or C above: →	Western

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
CIVIL COVER SHEET**

**IX(a). IDENTICAL CASES:** Has this action been previously filed in this court and dismissed, remanded or closed? ☒ NO ☐ YES

If yes, list case number(s): \_\_\_\_\_

**IX(b). RELATED CASES:** Have any cases been previously filed in this court that are related to the present case? ☒ NO ☐ YES

If yes, list case number(s): \_\_\_\_\_

**Civil cases are deemed related if a previously filed case and the present case:**

(Check all boxes that apply)

- ☐ A. Arise from the same or closely related transactions, happenings, or events; or
- ☐ B. Call for determination of the same or substantially related or similar questions of law and fact; or
- ☐ C. For other reasons would entail substantial duplication of labor if heard by different judges; or
- ☐ D. Involve the same patent, trademark or copyright, and one of the factors identified above in a, b or c also is present.

**X. SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY  
(OR SELF-REPRESENTED LITIGANT):** \_\_\_\_\_

DATE: 2-11-2014

**Notice to Counsel/Parties:** The CV-71 (JS-44) Civil Cover Sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required pursuant to Local Rule 3-1 is not filed but is used by the Clerk of the Court for the purpose of statistics, venue and initiating the civil docket sheet. (For more detailed instructions, see separate instructions sheet).

Key to Statistical codes relating to Social Security Cases:

Nature of Suit Code	Abbreviation	Substantive Statement of Cause of Action
861	HIA	All claims for health insurance benefits (Medicare) under Title 18, Part A, of the Social Security Act, as amended. Also, include claims by hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, etc., for certification as providers of services under the program. (42 U.S.C. 1935FF(b))
862	BL	All claims for "Black Lung" benefits under Title 4, Part B, of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969. (30 U.S.C. 923)
863	DIWC	All claims filed by insured workers for disability insurance benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended; plus all claims filed for child's insurance benefits based on disability. (42 U.S.C. 405 (g))
863	DIWW	All claims filed for widows or widowers insurance benefits based on disability under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42 U.S.C. 405 (g))
864	SSID	All claims for supplemental security income payments based upon disability filed under Title 16 of the Social Security Act, as amended.
865	RSI	All claims for retirement (old age) and survivors benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42 U.S.C. 405 (g))